

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,100,849 to *Tsubaki et al.* (“*Tsubaki*”).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants propose amending claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are pending for further consideration.

**All Subject Matter Complies with 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Tsubaki*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met (see MPEP §§ 2142-2143). First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. All three criteria must be met to establish obviousness.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Tsubaki* does not teach or suggest “a feeding electrode, having a first end which is connected to and directly contacts the feeding terminal and a second end which is connected to and directly contacts the ground electrode,” as recited in newly amended independent claim 1. Emphasis added. Support for the amendment is found at least at page 7, lines 11-20 and Figs. 1A and 1B of the specification.

Applicants amend claim 1 to better clarify the plain and ordinary meaning of the term “connection,” in light of the construction of the term presented in the Office Action. The Office Action alleges that *Tsubaki* shows a feeding terminal and feeding electrode connected via capacitance. Thus, *Tsubaki* cannot teach or suggest all the features of the present invention as amended. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the third prong of *prima facie* obviousness has not been met.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art”. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the third prong of *prima facie* obviousness has not been met. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because *Tsubaki* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of newly amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that newly amended independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the applied art and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. In view of the above arguments, the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn, at least because newly amended claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action also has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least because *Tsubaki* does not teach or suggest “a first part of the feeding electrode being extended in parallel with an elongated direction of the radiation electrode,” as recited in independent claim 1.

*Tsubaki* shows a slit s1, s2, or s3 between the first and second radiation electrodes that “is narrower at one end than at its other end and is, moreover, diagonal to every side of the second main face of the base.” See col. 3, lines 42-45 and Figs. 1-7 of *Tsubaki*. Assuming for the sake of argument the Office Action’s assertion that the two radiation electrodes (13, 14) of *Tsubaki* are instead the claimed feeding and radiation electrodes; the fact that they are specifically not parallel to each other by design in order to eliminate mutual interference and obtain stable double resonance between the electrodes, establishes that *Tsubaki* cannot teach or suggest the present invention. See col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 9 of the specification. Thus, *Tsubaki* does not teach or suggest the present invention and all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Additionally, as previously argued in our response filed January 5, 2005, *Tsubaki* shows a conventional “reverse F antenna” in Fig. 5. The background of the present invention states that conventional inverted-F type antennas suffer from problems where the impedance of the feeding terminal and the radiation electrode do not match as a result of the operation frequency adjustment of the radiation electrode. The necessity of moving the connection point of the feeding terminal becomes critical, making continuous adjustment of the reverse F antenna difficult. See page 2, line 17 through page 2, line 1 of the specification.

The present invention addresses these problems by providing a feeding electrode that runs parallel to the open side of the radiation electrode and then runs parallel to the elongated side of the radiation electrode before connecting to the ground electrode. Because the feeding electrode runs parallel to the open side of the radiation electrode which is far from the ground electrode, a maximum current may be established near the juncture of the radiation electrode and

the ground electrode. The maximum current, the distance between the feeding electrode and the radiation electrode, and the feeding electrode width also help create extremely stable coupling and coupling control between the feeding electrode and the radiation electrode. See page 12, line 25 through page 13, line 10 of the specification.

Thus, Fig. 5 of *Tsubaki* does not show the present invention at all. In fact, *Tsubaki* teaches away from the present invention because the conventional reverse F antenna shown in *Tsubaki* requires that the feed terminal and ground terminal be close to each other to minimize impedance matching problems. See col. 6, lines 44-50 of *Tsubaki* and the background section page 2, lines 17-21 of the specification. As mentioned above, this is opposite to the present invention which positions the open end of the radiation electrode far from the ground electrode to establish a maximum current near the juncture of the radiation electrode and the ground electrode.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the third prong of *prima facie* obviousness has not been met. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the applied art and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request that independent claim 1 is allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn, at least because their base claim is allowable, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, claims 1-4 are all allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Mary Jane Boswell  
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: October 11, 2005

**Customer No. 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel.: (202) 739-3000